

Draft Comprehensive Plan Review Planning Commission Minutes Chesterfield, Virginia 23832 April 14, 2011

PRESENT:

Mr. F. Wayne Bass, Chairman

Dr. William P. Brown, Vice Chairman

Mr. Russell Gulley

Mr. Sam R. Hassen

Mr. Reuben J. Waller, Jr.

Mr. Kirkland A. Turner, Secretary to the Commission, Planning Director

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. William Dupler, Interim Deputy County Administrator Community Development

Mr. George "Bubba" Bowles, Senior Engineer Utilities Department

Mr. James K. Bowling, Principal Planner, Advance Planning and Research Section, Planning Department

Mr. Robert V. Clay, Planning and Special Projects Manager, Development Review Section, Planning Department

Mr. Roy Covington, Director, Utilities Department

Ms. Barbara Fassett, Planning Manager, Advance Planning and Research Section, Planning Department

Battalion Chief James Fitch, Fire Administration, Budget & Planning Fire and EMS

Mr. Scott Flanigan, Senior Water Quality Analyst Environmental Engineering Department

Mr. Steven F. Haasch, Principal Planner, Advance Planning and Research Section, Planning Department

Mr. John Harmon, Real Property Manager
Utilities Department

Mr. Garrett Hart, Development Manager

Economic Development Department

Mr. Michael Janosik, Planning Administrator,

Development Review Section, Planning Department

Ms. Latisha Jenkins, Revitalization Coordinator,

Economic Development Department Mr. Glenn E. Larson, Assistant Director, Plans

and Information Section, Planning Department

Ms. Emily Masters, Administrative Secretary,

Advance Planning and Research Section, Planning Department

Mr. Zachary Mayo, Planning Data and Geographic Analyst,

Advance Planning and Research Section, Planning Department

Mr. R. John McCracken, Director,

Transportation Department

Mr. Richard M. McElfish, Director

Environmental Engineering Department

Ms. Pamela Nichols, Clerk to the Commission,

Administration Section, Planning Department

Ms. Jane Peterson, Planning and Special Projects Manager,

Development Review Section, Planning Department

Mr. Randy Phelps, Principal Engineer,

Utilities Department

Mr. David W. Robinson, Senior Assistant County Attorney,

County Attorney's Office

Ms. Beverly Rogers, Planning Administrator

Planning Department

Mr. Carl D. Schlaudt, Planning Manager, Development

Review Section, Planning Department

Fire Chief Loy Senter, Fire Administration,

Fire and EMS

Mr. Steven Simonson, Senior Civil Engineer

Transportation Department

Mr. Michael E. Tompkins, Assistant Director,

Development Review Section, Planning Department

Captain Tommy Tucker, Fire Administration,

Fire and EMS

Mr. Jack Watts, Environmental Health Manager

Chesterfield Health Department

Mr. Rick Witt, Interim Director,

Building Inspection Department

Mr. Dave Wolverton, Microcomputer Analyst

Information Systems Technology

Mr. Bill Wright, Assistant Director Engineering,

Utilities Department

ASSEMBLY AND WORK SESSION.

Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen, Waller and staff assembled at 1:00 p. m. in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building, 10001 Iron Bridge Road Chesterfield, VA, for a work session.

I. CALL TO ORDER.

Mr. Bass, Chairman, called the meeting to order in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building.

II. INVOCATION.

Mr. Hassen presented the invocation.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The Commissioners led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Mr. Turner advised the Commission there were no minutes for the Commission's consideration.

V. FOLLOW-UP ITEMS.

Mr. Bass commented that the portion of the Reference Handbook relative to Chesterfield County and the Chesapeake Bay was very helpful; and that some of the information should be included as part of the draft Plan.

In response to Mr. Gulley's question, Ms. Heather Barrar stated the presentation on Natural and Cultural Resources will include some data relative to water quality. Mr. Gulley recommended adding data on Agricultural Uses as part of the Action Items.

Mr. Hassen questioned whether the Environmental Quality Element would include language pertaining to Riverfront development; and stated he expected to see similar data from the current Riverfront Area Plan.

Presentation by Utilities Department.

Mr. Roy Covington provided an overview of the Utilities Department's performance. He stated the Department of Utilities' performance included the Platinum Award for Utility Excellence from the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA) in 2008, and noted Chesterfield Utilities was one (1) of three (3) in the country to have a AAA rating from all three (3) rating agencies; and was one (1) of the few drinking water utilities that have never had a primary drinking water standard violation. He then provided graphs showing the comparison of user rates and connection fees. He also stated Chesterfield Utilities was one of few utilities that have established a "Rate Stabilization Fund" to address replacement of aging infrastructure. Mr. Covington then provided data on the locations of the twenty-three (23) existing water storage tanks, water storage tanks under construction, water treatment plants, annual water usage, future water supply and demand management strategies. He noted as a result of the 2002 drought, State regulatory agencies required all water suppliers to develop a "Water Supply Plan" to address future water supply challenges and resources. He also stated the Demand Management Strategies included educating customers on proper irrigation needs for their lawns, educating customers about drought tolerant landscape - xeriscape, educating customers in older homes without water conservation devices and converting the low flow fixtures; and tiered billing rate structure. He then provided data on the public wastewater treatment plants, Turner Road processing station, wastewater trunk lines and force mains, and flows to the City of Richmond, Falling Creek (FCWWTP), Proctors Creek (PCWWTP) Wastewater Treatment Plants, and South Central Waste Water Authority (SCWWA). He stated the Department's goal is to be responsible protectors of the environment; and summarized challenges associated with meeting current regulatories. He stated water reuse will become more a part of our culture; and that the Utilities Department was working with the Department of Economic Development on marketing industrial properties adjacent to wastewater facilities for businesses that have potential for using recycled wastewater. In conclusion he stated the Utilities Department has purposely delayed updating its Water and Wastewater Facilities Plan so that the process would coincide with the new Comprehensive Plan; and the Utilities Water and Wastewater Facilities Plan would support and supplement the new Comprehensive Plan.

In response to Mr. Bass' question, Mr. Covington stated Utilities will develop the necessary infrastructure to serve new developments; that the traditional philosophy is "development pays for itself", therefore, development of that area would support the utilities. He further stated the utility system is not likely sized appropriate for Urban Developed Areas (UDAs); and it might be preferable to look at the existing infrastructure and its impact on infrastructure. For example, he stated selection for a more dense area should factor in substantial infrastructure in terms of water, wastewater and transportation.

Mr. Gulley stated the Commission questioned whether Utilities could support the proposed UDAs and was advised by staff that it was more cost efficient to infill versus developing in an undeveloped area.

In response to Mr. Gulley's comment, Mr. Covington stated, from an engineering standpoint, if a UDA site was selected, engineers would be responsible for identifying the water demands and the wastewater flows that are generated from the development. He stated there would be several options to consider; however, it was his hope that the philosophy "development pays for itself" remains.

Mr. Covington responded to Mr. Hassen's comment and stated the Turner Road Pumping Station would divert flow to Proctors Creek; and included in the ten (10) year Plan is another pumping facility at Falling Creek to divert flow to Proctors Creek and the water and wastewater needs are met well into the future.

In response to Mr. Hassen's question, Mr. Steven Haasch stated the consultants did a study on the usage rate for water and sewer at the buildout of the Plan in conjunction with Utilities. Mr. Covington stated the Utilities Master Plan is designed on a fifty (50) year buildout; and it is not reasonable to plan Utilities Facilities for 150 years out because water supply typically has a designed life. Mr. Covington further stated his presentation provided projection of the Utilities capabilities for water and wastewater into the future based on today's Land Uses. He stated the capability to accommodate growth extends beyond the typical planning period for Utility Facilities.

Dr. Brown stated the cost of upgrading facilities in developed areas versus building new facilities is only one (1) of the relative cost benefit concerns in deciding to do infill or expand westward; and to focus on any one (1) component runs the risk of making the wrong decision for the County.

In response to Mr. Waller's question, Mr. Covington stated the Utilities Department is engaged in developing the Water and Wastewater Master Facilities Plan consistent with the new Comprehensive Plan. He stated it is typical and traditional to develop a Utilities Plan based on a period of fifty (50) years.

Mr. Bass expressed concern that all models are based on a 150 year buildout; however, the Utilities Plan is based on a fifty (50) year buildout.

In response to Mr. Bass' comment, Mr. Covington stated the Utilities Department feels comfortable with providing growth out through the year 2060 and beyond on wastewater in terms of the planned expansions.

Mr. Turner stated the purpose for designing toward buildout is to feel comfortable that the short term direction set for the County will be the direction the County is headed toward at buildout. He stated the Comprehensive Plan is updated every five (5) years to reflect the current technology and market. He further stated the County does not endorse the UDA concept; however, UDA designation is mandated by the State; and there many factors that contributes toward the location of UDA.

Mr. Hassen suggested the Commission to reorder the agenda to move Item VIII, Water/Wastewater to be heard before Items VI, Housing and VII, Natural and Cultural Resources.

It was the consensus of the Commission to reorder the agenda as noted above.

The Commission recessed at 2:30 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 2:40 p.m.

VIII. WATER/WASTEWATER.

Mr. Bass asked the Commission to try to avoid deviating from the topics of discussion.

The Commission reviewed the Water/Wastewater Element. A summary of the Commission's recommendations, to be voted on at a future work session, is set forth below:

In response to Mr. Gulley's questions, Mr. Covington stated planning for a water resource is not an effort that takes fifty (50) or sixty (60) years; and incrementally the Water Supply Plan is sufficient for sixty (60) years. He stated staff will consider translating data from the Water Supply Plan into Action Items to be included in the Water/Wastewater Element; to include alternative initiative such as the Water Management Strategies.

The Commission requested that a note be made to review recommendations Bookmark W 1.1.1 and W 1.1.2 – after the review of Land Uses.

Mr. Gulley stated the policies relative to Water/Wastewater are broad categories that are not necessarily focused on Economic Growth, but focused on a Water/Wastewater Strategy for the entire County; and recommended for staff to relook at Goal 2: Economic Growth.

Mr. Larson stated at the request of the Commission, staff will review the Goals, Objectives and Recommendations in this section and try to increase the relationship between Economic Growth and Water and Wastewater provisions to include emphasis on the commercial aspects.

- W 1.1.5 Master Plan Update Cycle: Change wording to read "Coordinate Encourage the update cycle of the Chesterfield County Water and Wastewater Master Plan to coincide align with the update cycle of the Comprehensive Plan".
- W 3.1.1 Private Systems: Change wording to read "Prohibit the use of privately owned and operated wastewater treatment plants for residential or commercial developments except as **required** allowed under state law".
- W 3.1.2 Wastewater Reuse: Add wording to read "Encourage reuse of treated wastewater treatment plant effluent where appropriate, under no circumstances would treated wastewater plant effluent be used in potable water supplies".

In response to Mr. Waller's question, Mr. Larson stated the consultants looked at a number of policy directions and in the evolution or recommendations, the Hanover approach is not incorporated in the draft Plan. Mr. Haasch stated the consultants reviewed the Utilities' Business Model and the consultants' analysis to how Utility functions; and the recommendations in the draft Plan reflects and supports the way Utilities have operated. He also stated the draft Plan takes in account the existing Utilities' system.

In response to Dr. Brown's question, Mr. Covington stated Utilities agreed with "W 1.1.1 Utility Infrastructure and Growth" based on buildout.

In response to Mr. Hassen's question, Mr. Haasch stated the UDA designation within the Bermuda District was partly based on water treatment issues on the Jefferson Davis Corridor.

Mr. Gulley voiced concern with the overall densities in infill areas.

Mr. Turner reiterated that staff was meeting the State mandate for UDAs; that staff was trying to recommend reasonable land uses for all properties; and development will occur based upon market conditions on a graduated basis. He further stated there are ways for achieving balance; and the foundation of the draft Plan is to protect and sustain established communities. He also stated the Vision for the County was based upon promoting a greater variety of choices in recognizing and enhancing those characteristics that the residents found value; and residents want to preserve, protect and enhance existing developed areas and protect the rural character of the southern and western part of the County.

W 3.1.4 Change wording to read "Water and Wastewater Systems in **Established** Communities and Commercial Areas: Ensure that the capacities of county water and wastewater systems in **established** communities and commercial areas are adequate to meet future growth".

Mr. Waller requested additional information on the South Central Wastewater Authority (SCWWA).

Move W 5.1 Water Use; W 5.1.1 Enforcement; W 5.1.2 Reuse; W 5.1.3 Reduction; W 5.1.4 Non-Farm Irrigation; and W 5.1.5 Water Resources to a newly created W 4.2; Water Use; W 4.2.1 Enforcement; W 4.2.2 Reuse; W 4.2.3 Reduction; W 4.2.4 Non-Farm Irrigation; and W 4.2.5 Water Resources.

Move W 5.2 Clean Water; W 5.2.1 Chemical Leaks; W 5.2.2 Toxic Materials; W 5.2.3 Disturbance; W 5.2.4 Point and Non-Point Source Pollution; to the new Element for Environmental Quality.

X. <u>FUTURE WORK SESSION SCHEDULE.</u>

It was the consensus of the Commission to discuss future meeting dates for the draft Comprehensive Plan work sessions; and to discuss the remainder of the agenda at a future work session.

Mr. Bass reminded the Commission that the meeting dates for the month of May were May 5, 2011, May 19, 2011 and May 23, 2011; and asked the Commission to consider scheduling the following meeting dates for the month of June: June 6, 2011, June 23, 2011 and June 30, 2011.

On motion of Dr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Waller, the Commission resolved to schedule work sessions for Review of the Draft Comprehensive Plan for June 6, 2011, June 23, 2011 and June 30, 2011.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

Mr. Turner advised the Commission of an offer for a presentation from the Richmond Association of Realty. Mr. Robinson reminded the Commission that the work sessions were open to the public; however there is no public comment period; therefore, the Commission should decline the offer.

In response to Mr. Gulley's question on the contract of the draft Plan, Mr. Larson stated staff has almost completed the evaluation.

VI.	H	OU	SIN	١G.
-----	---	----	-----	-----

The Commission will continue review of the Housing Element at a future work session.

VII. NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES.

The Commission will review the Natural and Cultural Resources Element at a future work session.

IX. POTENTIAL CITIZENS DISTRICT MEETINGS.

The Commission will discuss Potential Citizens District Meetings at a future work session.

XI. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, it was on motion of Dr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Gulley, that the meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m. to Tuesday, April 19, 2011, at 3 p.m., in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building, Chesterfield, Virginia.

Chairman/Date	Secretary/Date